

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Tlóin do Ohia an rna hánduib, agur ríodcáin ain an dealam deagcoil do na dáoinib.

LUKE ii. 14.

PUBLISHED THE MIDDLE OF EVERY MONTH, AT 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET, DUBLIN.

Vol. V.—No. 56.

AUGUST 15, 1856.

Annual Subscription, 3s. 6d.; Unstamped Copies, 3d. each. Payable in Advance,

CONTENTS.

					age
The See of Peter-No. I. Was the Apostle Peter	eve	r Bis	pob	of	
Rome?		•	•		85
The Dousy Bible, its History and Authority					87
Religious Persecution-Mahomet and Christ					88
The Dumb Village—Chap. I.					89
When was the Bishop of Rome first called "the Vi	car (of Ch	rist i	***	90
Strength of the Church of Rome				•	91
Correspondence:					
Mr. Nash on Controversy	•				92
An Old Reader on Roman Supremacy					93
Mr. W. Rourke on Transubstantiation					93
Black Heretics and White Heretics-by	Pat	Mur	ray	of	
Westmeath					94
Connemara Wells-by A Worshipper at the	We	1			95
Requiescat in Pace-by X. P					95
On Early Hay-making - by Rusticus					95

THE SEE OF ST. PETER.

THE supremacy claimed by the Church of Rome over all other Churches is based upon the three following propositions:—1st. That our Blessed Lord gave St. Peter positions:—1st. That our Biessed Lord gave St. Peter not merely a primacy of dignity or precedency in honour and rank over all the rest of his Apostles, but a primacy of jurisdiction, and a supreme power over the whole Church, including the several local Churches personally founded by St. John, St. James, St. Paul, and the rest of the Apostles. 2ndly. That our Lord ordained that of the Apostles. 2ndly. That our Lord ordained that these powers should not terminate with the Apostle, St. Peter, personally, but were to be transmitted to his successors; and, 3rdly. That the Bishops of Rome were, alone, the successors of St. Peter, and that to them these supreme powers have been transmitted, in an unbroken succession, from St. Peter's death to the present day. If any one of these three links in the chain which supports the Roman supremacy fails, it is obvious that the whole structure must necessarily fall with it.

We propose to consider each of these propositions with the seriousness it deserves, but, for the present, would

the seriousness it deserves, but, for the present, would confine ourselves to a few observations upon the last, and most practically important of them, viz.: Are the Bishops of Rome, alone, the successors of St. Peter?

That St. Peter's authority, whatever it was, must have been rather in his Apostolic than his Episcopal character, we should have thought almost self-environment.

we should have thought almost self-evident, if we had not known how the minds of men are often warped by an anxiety to uphold a pre-conceived system.

St. Peter had admittedly no successor in his character of

an Apostle, any more than St. Paul had. It is, therefore, necessary to the Supremacy of the Church of Rome that the succession should be connected with his inferior character of Bishop, and that St. Peter should be proved to have been the first Bishop of Rome, without which the whole theory of the Papal Supremacy falls to the ground, even if the other links in the chain were satisfactorily es-tablished. The burthen of proof here lies clearly on the supporters of the claims of the See of Rome, and that proof Roman Catholic writers undertake to furnish, and triumphantly refer to certain passages in ancient writers which speak of the Church of Rome as "founded by St. Peter," as "the Chair of Peter," as "the See of Peter," as if such expressions established satisfactorily all that was necessary expressions established satisfactorily all that was necessary to prove that St. Peter lived and died exclusively Bishop of Rome and of no other see or city. There are, we think, many difficulties in the way of Roman Catholic advocates in attempting to prove this alleged historical fact.

St. Jerome, in the 5th century, distinctly asserts, both of St. Peter and St. Paul, that they were not bishops of any one city, but of the whole globe.

Father Henschenius, commenting on the old Roman Calendar, also assigned to the beginning of the fifth centure.

Calendar, also assigned to the beginning of the fifth century, and inserted in the Acta Sanctorum (1st vol. for April)—says, "St. Peter undertook the Episcopate after Christ's ascension, but without its being limited to any given place" (sed nulli certo loco adstrictum).

" Non solum unius urbis sed totius orbis erant Episcopi" (Petrus et Panins). St. Hieron. Epist. Adversus Vigilantium.

Irenæus and Eusebius are sometimes supposed to have stated that St. Peter was bishop of Rome; but we shall see that this is not the case

Henry de Valois (Valesius), the Roman Catholic com-mentator on Eusebius, acknowledges that neither Irenæus, or Eusebius in his history, ever spoke of Peter as a Bishop any-Eusebius in his history, ever spoke of Peter as a Bishop anywhere, and that it is a great mistake to suppose they do.

'The Apostles,' says Valesius, 'had a rank peculiar to themselves, nor werethey ever reckoned among the bishops of the Churches.'—(On Eusebius iii. 14.) And again—

'It must not be forgotten that Eusebius never reckoned the Apostles among the Bishops of the Churches, as I have already remarked.

Irenæus, as well as Eusebius, says, that Peter and Paul laid the first foundations of the Church which was in Rome, but these writers nowhere reckon them among the Bishops

laid the first foundations of the Church which was in Rome, but these writers nowhere reckon them among the Bishops of that Church—(Valesius on Eusebius, iii. 21). These few passages illustrate difficulty the first, and show that in the 5th century St. Peter was not considered to have been in any special or exclusive sense connected with the See of Rome. Let us now come down later still, and see what was thought of the matter by writers of the 7th century. 7th century.

Our readers will remember that the Irish Saint, Columbanus, in writing to Pope Boniface IV. about A.D. 613, calls Rome the head of all the churches of the Western world (Europe), and second only to that of Jerusalem.⁴ It will also be remembered that St. Cummian, in his celebrated letter to Segienus of Iona, pleads in favour of his views, not on the authority of the Apostolic See of Rome, but of what he calls the "fourfold Apostolic See—Rome, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria."

Whether St. Peter founded the see of Antioch in person

is doubtful; but it is supposed that he founded that of

Alexandria, through the instrumentality of Mark.

Accordingly, we find noless remarkable a man than St.

Gregory the Great (himself a Bishop of Rome in the 7th century), when in writing to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, referring to each branch of what he termed the triple see of St. Peter—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch—as having equal claims with one another both in honour and suthority; and disclaiming any special honour to himself. authority; and disclaiming any special honour to himself, inasmuch as the Bishop of Alexandria, to whom he was writing, was himself one of St. Peter's successors.

writing, was himself one of St. Peter's successors. Can anything be more conclusive than the foregoing documents to prove that Rome was not considered, either in the 5th or 7th centuries, as paramount to all other Churches, or exclusively the See of Peter?

It is plain that neither St. Jerome, nor St. Columbanus, St. Cummian, nor St. Gregory the Great, had ever heard of the doctrine of Papal Supremacy, or dreamed of the See of Rome being the mistress of all other Churches, because it was the bishopric in which St. Peter died, or on any other ground whatever.

We now proceed to the next difficulty in the way of the Papal theory, which is, that while there were twelve

Apostles, each with the power of teaching all nations, there could be but one Bishop of any local see, whereas St. Peter and St. Paul were both Bishops of Rome, if either

b Valesius indeed refers to a passage in what is called the "Chronicon" of Eusebius, in which the Episcopacy of Rome is attributed to St. Peter, but we purpose showing in our next number that the work there referred to cannot be relied on, for reasons which would require too much sace to be referred.

of them was such, in that local and limited sense which slope would support the theory contended for. We shall alone would support the theory contended for. We alsee this more clearly when we proceed a little further.

Nothing, we think, tends more to embarrass those who are honestly searching for truth, than for controversialists to assume a broader ground of opposition than historical facts and evidence will warrant.

There have not been wanting writers who have denied St. Peter ever visited Rome, or that the Church of Rome

St. Peter ever visited Rome, or that the Church of Rome could, in any sense, have been founded by that Apostle. We, however, are not disposed to deny that the Church at Rome was, in a certain sense, founded both by St. Peter and St. Paul; but we think it of some moment to a true understanding of the real relation which existed between Rome, as well as other Churches, and those great Apostles, to investigate a little more closely than is ordinarily done in what way the Roman Church was founded by either St. Peter or St. Paul.

A very simple investigation into the subject will satisfy any impartial inquirer that such expressions as—"Founded by St. Peter," "See of St. Peter," "Chair of St. Peter, and the like, as understood by the earliest writers and Fathers of the Church—bore a very different meaning from

Fathers of the Church—bore a very different meaning from that usually attributed to them in modern controversy. Let us try the case by what is said about other Churches,

such as those we have already named of Alexandria and Antioch, with respect to which no motive for a strained opinion exists in the minds of controversial writers on either side.

Now, what does Cardinal Baronius, the great Roman Catholic historian, say as to the foundation of those sees?

"What does it mean," says he (A.D. 39, paragraph 16), "when Peter is said to have founded the Church of Antioch? They are quite wrong who think that Peter must have gone to Antioch for that purpose. When we say that Peter founded the See of Antioch, this must not be supposed to imply that Peter was among the first who preached there; for that, it is quite evident, was done exdriven from Jerusalem." Baron. Annales tom. i. p. 272.
So, with respect to Alexandria, the same writersays—"As

So, with respect to Alexandria, the same writer says—"As Peter's chair at Alexandria was founded by that Apostle, though it cannot be made to appear that Peter ever was there, it is quite evident that his presence was not necessary to found even a patriarchal See." Idem. p. 272. Before going farther it may be of use to call our reader's attention to the brief Scriptural narrative of the matter. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. ii., v. 5-11, that at the time when the Holy Ghost fell on the Apostles at the feast of Pentecost (A.D. 33), there were dwelling at Jerusalem devout Jews out of every nation under heaven—"Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and inhabiheaven—"Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and innaortants of Mesopotamia, Judea, and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia, Egypt, and the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, Jews and Proselytes, Cretes, and Arabians"—and St. Peter, standing up with the eleven, addressed this assembled multitude, including Etzeen, addressed this assembled indutate, including strangers from Rome, as well as dwellers in Asia and Egypt (no doubt among others, inhabitants of Antioch and Alexandria), and called on them all to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, "whereby," says the sacred historian, v. 41, "in one day 3,000 souls were converted to the faith, who are stated not only to have been baptized forthwith, but to have steadfastly continued in the papuzed torthwith, but to have steadfastly continued in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers'—forming, in fact, the first Christian Church—"to which the Lord added daily such as should be saved."—v. 47.

When this miraculous effect was produced in so short a time, we cannot be surprised to find that in one or two years afterwards, A.D. 34, 35, when the persecution arose

years afterwards, A.D. 34, 35, when the persecution arose about Stephen, 15,000 members of the Church h (according to the calculation of Cardinal Baronius) must have been collected at Jerusalem, containing in fact the first members of all the most ancient Churches, who were then scattered

g" Peter," says the learned Father Tillemont, "pronounced that discourse in the name of the other Apostles, who all spoke by his mouth and who authorized him by their presence; for they could not all speak at once; a remark in which he was preceded by St. Chrysostom—"They allowed Peter to speak for them, for they could not all speak together." So St. Cyprian, "Petrus unus pro omnibus loquens et ecclesia voce respondens ait, &c."—Epis. \$5, p. 83. Bened, Ed. Paris, 1736.

Annales Tom. 1. p. 250. "Ultra quindecim millis credentium."

abroad and went about everywhere eaching the Word-See Acts viii. 1. 4.

Cardinal Baronius's account of this foundation, or first creation of the Christian Churches (Annales A.D. 35,

paragraphs 1, 2, and 3), is as follows:—p. 248-9.

"In the 35th year after the birth of Christ, all the Christians tians, except the Apostles, were compelled to leave Jerusalem on Stephen's death, when they proceeded into different countries, the most widely separated from one ano-In these countries they preached the Gospel, and enabled the Apostles, in this manner, to multiply under favourable circumstances the Churches of God. For it was vourable circumstances the Churches of God. not only into Judea and Samaria, as Luke mentions, chap. viii., that these first Christians travelled. He also talls us most distinctly that they passed the frontiers of Palestine, and went into other countries-See Acts xi. 19. "Now, they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but the Jews only," but very successfully it would appear from verse 21, where it is said, "The hand of the Lord was with them; and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." "We find also," continues Cardinal Baronius, "that an immense number of these first Jewish converts went into Asia, to whom Peter afterwards wrote tis Epistles, inscribed to those scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.

For the Jews lived far and wide, in Asia, and Africa, and even Europe, as well as within the limits of the Holy Land; and that the number of these first Christians was very great, is evident; for if any one will only calculate them, and reflect that none but the Apostles remained at Jerusa lem, he will find that several thousand Christians must

That the Fathers believed the Church of Rome to have existed about the same period appears from what they say of the Emperor Tiberius, and his differences with the Roman Senate respecting it. Tiberius died in the spring of A.D. 37; and during his life the Christian Church at Rome had gained such importance and notoriety, that it is said that Tiberius actually proposed to the Senate that Jesus Christ should be worshipped among the gods of Rome. If Orosius is to be believed—"The Senate not only refused this apotheosis of the Saviour, but passed a law for the expulsion of the Christian Church from Rome—which, however, Tiberius neutralized by a counter mandate, threatening death to those who should bring the necessary accusations against the members of this community-Lib. vii. c. 4.

have been scattered over the world on that occasion.

All this, it will be remembered, is alleged to have occurred before the spring of A.D. 37, and, therefore, within two years after the dispersion of the disciples of Jerusalem, who were scattered upon Stephen's martyrdom, in A.D. 34, and while the Apostles, including St. Peter, were residing at Jerusalem, where they continued, according to the most eminent writers, including Baronius, for about twelve years, before their departure (or Exodus) out of Judea.

That this is the view taken by the early Fathers of the mode in which the Churches of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome were founded by the Apostles, is easily demonstrated; and we may give, as further illustration of what we have already said, one or two passages, in which the subject is dealt with in a very brief and explicit manner

St. IRENÆUS, observing on the addresses of St. Peter, in the second and subsequent chapters of the Acts, says—"These are the words of that Church at Jerusalem by which EVERY OTHER CHURCH was commenced;" and GREGORY OF NYSSE, who lived A.D. 390, in his sermon on St. Stephen, says—"From this time the disciples of the twelve began to traverse the whole world, and this was the beginning of the diffusion of the Gospel in all quarters; for if the Jews had not thus persecuted the first Christians after Stephen's murder, perhaps the blessings of the Gospel might have been confined to Jerusalem." What can more plainly show that St. Peter and the other Apostles were considered as having founded distant Churches through the instrumentality of others, rather than personally themselves.

It would be easy to multiply quotations from learned Roman Catholic writers of the highest character, to the same effect :-

"They hold," says Tillemont, "that St. Peter founded "Iney hold," says Illiemont, "that St. Peter founded the See of Alexandria, and that he did so through the instrumentality of Mark." "If others," says Baronius, "preached at Antioch before Peter, and were thus considered to have founded the Church, Peter and Paul cannot, in that sense, be said to be its founders; but if, on the other hand, Peter is to be considered to have founded the Church of Antioch protein that adding the interest of the church of Antioch protein the church of th the Church of Antioch, notwithstanding that it was not he who introduced the Gospel there, Paul is certainly en-titled to be considered, in this light, quite as much as Peter; for Paul did quite as much as Peter to promote that object. So that St. Ignatius, writing to the Magne-

rent that the Church at Rome was founded by both St. Peter and St. Paul.

St. Irenœus (in chap. iii. 3) speaks of the Church at Rome as that greatest and most ancient Church, known to all, which was founded and constituted by the two most glorious Apostles, Paul and Peter, but says nothing of either of them being Bishop of Rome."

Dionysius of Corinth also calls it the plantation of Peter and Paul. And Epiphanius says, Peter and Paul

were first at Rome both Apostles and bishops.

It follows plainly, from all this, that in whatever light we view St. Peter and St. Paul, whether as Apostles or Bishops, St. Paul must be acknowledged to have had quite as much to do personally with the foundation and building up of the Church at Rome as St. Peter, except so far mercly as St. Peter's addresses and conversions at Jerusalem, at the feast of Pentecost, may be considered as having originally sowed the seeds of all the most ancient Churches. We need scarcely refer to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans, which he wrote long before his personal presence among them (which is clear from his speaking in that letthe Church at Rome as a flourishing Church, and his expressly alluding to his not having yet been able to go there—ch. xv., v. 22, 24). It will, of course, be also remembered how St. Paul, subsequently, for two years so-journed there (ch. xxviii., v. 30) in his own hired house, receiving all that came unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

While, however, the personal part taken by St. Paul in building up the Church at Rome seems to have exceeded anything recorded of St. Peter (who cannot be proved even to have resided there at all), we are not to assume that St. Peter, and the eleven other Apostles with whom he was associated, did nothing to edify or advance the Church at Rome during the twelve years that they remained together at Jerusalem after the dispersion of the disciples before spoken of; on the contrary, there can be no doubt, from what St. Luke tells us in the Acts, that, as long as the Apostles remained together at Jerusalem, they occupied themselves in not only strengthening the foundations of the Roman Church, by their intercourse with the Roman converts already made, but that they also contributed to its extension and edification, by sending over, from time to time, fresh supplies of converts from the Roman Jews—either from those of them who, as Philo informs us (De Legatione ad Caium, p. 1014, Frankfort ed. 1691), repaired to Jerusa-lem with the proceeds of the first fruit offerings every year, or from such other Roman Jews as for any other purpose visited that city, in which, for their accommodation, there was a Roman synagogue with a school attached to it. doubt that in this way the Apostles added to that Church daily; and that not converts only, but persons whom they deputed to preach for them on their return, and to baptize for them at Rome.

There are two other passages in Irenæus which deserve attention, as bearing on this subject, and which distinctly treat St. Peter and St. Paul as equally engaged in evangelizing and founding the Christian Church at Rome, at a time too when it is clear that neither of them were there

in person, and, therefore, could only have been so engaged in the manner we have already referred to.

The Greek term "evangelizing," we may premise, denotes as well instructing a Church by written documents as by oral preaching, and was indeed subsequently applied almost exclusively to written instructions. There is also another sense in which that expression is used, which we shall best explain by referring to eminent writers and critics, Roman Catholic as well as Protestant. "In the beginning of Christianity," says Father Calmet, in his Dictionary, "there christiantly, says rather Caimet, in his Dictionary, "incre were evangelists and preachers, who, without being fixed to any Church, preached wherever they were led by the Holy Spirit." "We learn from Eusebius and other writers, cited by Suicer," says Dr. Bloomfield, "that in the Apostolic Church 'evangelists' was the appellation given to those preachers who aided the labours of the Apostles, not by taking charge of any particular Church, but by acting as itinerant preachers and teachers wherever their labours might be needed, and thus building on a foundation previously laid by the Apostles."

Let us now look at the passages in Irenseus above alluded to.

"Matthew," says Irenæus (Lib. iii. c. 1.), "published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were engaged in evangelizing and founding the Christian Church at Rome. And after their departure, Mark, also the disciple and interpreter of Peter, gave us in writing what Peter made the peculiar subject of his proclamations to the dispersion."

Now, the Gospel of St. Matthew was published, at latest, A.D. 41, before either St. Paul or St. Peter could have personally visited Rome; while Irenæus here states they personally visited Rome; while Ireneus here states they were engaged in "evangelizing and founding" the Church there, at the date of the publication of St. Matthew's Gospel, which corroborates, in the strongest manner, our view of the matter, and proves clearly that the Apostles' presence in a city was not at all necessary to enable them to "found," "plant," "erect," or "evangelize," a Church there; which being once well understood, we shall be the less in danger of drawing unsound conclusions from similar res in the ancient writers, who have incidentally and less distinctly alluded to the subject.

The third passage from Irenæus (Lib. iii. 3.) will require no explanation, but affords, we think, the clearest confirmation of the views we have above given. It is thus: "The blessed Apostles having founded and edified (or built) that Church (of Rome), gave the ministration of its Epiz-copal duties to Linus. This is the Linus whom Paul men-tions in his Epistles to Timothy."

We think we have now established, beyond any reasonable doubt, that the meaning attached by the early writers to the phrases "founding" or "evangelizing" a Church does not prove or imply that the founder had any personal, much less any exclusive, relation to it; that St. Peter was as much considered by them the founder of the other ancient Churches, at Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, as he was of that at Rome, and also that St. Paul was just as much the founder of the Church of Rome (to say the least of it) as St. Peter; and, consequently, that if St. Peter could be justly considered as Bishop of Rome, St. Paul must also be considered as Bishop of Rome, at the same period, a consequence which seems to us to establish clearly that, though both were Apostolic founders of the Church at Rome, neither of them was ever Bishop of Rome.

The third difficulty in the way of the Roman Catholic advocate, in his attempts to prove that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and held that See until his death (which is also admittedly necessary to the doctrines we are considering) is, that it seems indisputable that there were, at least, two other Bishops of Rome (if not three) successively one after another, during the lifetime of St. Peter and St. Paul—viz., Linus and Clemens, which seems absolutely inconsistent with either St. Peter or St. Paul having been themselves Bishops of Rome, though they both may have had Apostolic authority over that as well as all other Churches.

The Apostolical Constitutions (so called), a very ancient work, written, probably, in the third century, represent Linus as ordained first Bishop of Rome by St. Paul, and Clement, after the death of Linus, ordained Bishop of Rome by St. Peter.

Tertullian, also, tells us that Clement was ordained by

St Peter.

We have already seen what St. Epiphanius says upon this subject, interposing, however, another bishop, Cletus, between Linus and Clemens, expressly adding that Clemens, who followed Cletus, was contemporary with both St. Peter and St. Paul.

Irencus also tells us that Anacletus succeeded Linus, and that Clemens, in the third place from the Apostles, obtained the Bishopric, who himself saw the Apostles, and conferred with them."

Eusebius reckons the Bishops of Rome thus-Linus (Book iii., c. 2.); Anacletus (c. 13.); Clemens (c. 15); and he says, that Clement was the third Bishop of Rome.

Eusebius tells us, c. 34, that Evaristus succeeded

τ" θεμελιώσαντες οδυ καί οίκοδομήσαντες οί μακάριοι 'Απόστολοι την 'Εκκλησίαν, Λίνψ της Επισκο-

πης λευστολοι την Εκκλησίαν, Λίνω της Επισκο-πης λευτουργίαν ενεχειρισαν." Fundantes igitur et instruentes beati Apostoli Ecclesiam Liuo epis-copatum administrande ecclesia tradiderunt.— Ireneus Ben. Ed. 176., Grabes Ed.p. 202.

. Τής δὲ 'Ρωμάιων 'Εκκλησίας Δίνος μέν ὁ Κλανδίας πρωτος ύπο Παύλου, Κλήμης δε μετα τον Δίνου Θάνατον ὑπ' εμοῦ Πέτρου δεύτερος κεχειροτόνηται. Const. Apost. 7.

Linum Claudies filium ecclesiæ Romanorum episcopum, primum a Paulo ordinatum, post mortem vero Lini Clementem, quem ego. Petrus secundum ordinavi.—Apos. Con. vil., c. 47. Labbe and Coss.,

Con. Gen. I., 452.

* Romanorum ecclesiae Clementem & Petro ordinatum edit."—

Tert. de Præsor. 32.

"Irenæus Grabe's Ed., 202. Ben. Ed., 176.—". tertlo loco ab Apostolis episcopatum sortitur Clemens qui et vidit Apostolos et contulit cum eis."

, " ὁ Κλημης τῆς 'Ρωμαίων καὶ αὐτὸς εκκλησίας τρίτος ἐπίσκοπος καταστάς (c. 4)."

i The whole account will be found as laughh in Bertullian (Apol. v.), asebius (ii. 3), p. 82, and many other writers.

j " Αυται φωναί της Επελησιας, εξ ής πασα έσχηπεν

εκελυσια την αρχήν." Η w voces Ecclesia ex qua habuit omnia Ecclesia initium. Ironeus contra harcese, Lib, iii. c. 12, p. 196. Ben. ed., 1710. c. 23. Grabe, Oxon, 1702, p. 226.

[‡] Greg. Nyssen. Oper. Parts ed. 1573. p. 495.

[‡] His. Eccle to u. i. p. 552. Paris ed. 1693.

sians, says that Paul had as much to do with the foundasion of the Church at Antioch as Peter had, and that the Church of Antioch was founded by both of them.

In the same sense, and we think in ne other, it is appa-

m Irongus, p. 175., Ben. Kd. Grabes Ed. Oxon, p. 2v1.—"Sed queniam valde longum est in hoc tall volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximus, et antiquisimae et omnibus cognita, a gioriosiamina dusobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romes fundame et constitutes Ecclesia, &c., &c."

[&]quot;"Τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου και Παθλου φυτείαν."—Dionys. Corinth, apnd. Euseb. 2, 25.

ο "Εν Ρωμή γαρ γεγονασι πρωτοι Πετρος και Παύλος Αποσολοι αυτοι και Επισκοποι, ειτα Λινος είτα Κλουτος ειτα Κλημηνς συγχρονος ων Πετρέ και Παυλέ.

[&]quot;Etenim Romse primi omuium Petrus et Paulus Apostoli pariter atque Episcopi fuerunt. Inde Linus, tunc Cletus. Post hunc Clemens Petri et Pauli temporum sequalis."

Epiph. Dionysins Petarius Jesuit edition, ad hæres. Lib. tom. ii., cap.6, hæres. Carpocratiani xxvii., p. 107.—Paris, 1622. We believe Epiphanius, who was Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, A.D. 403, was the earliest writer who applies the term "Bishop" in any way to St. Peter.

p G-abe's Ed., p. 198. Ben. Ed., 174. "Ita Matthmus in Hebresis ipsorum lingua Scripturam edidit Evangelii, cum Petrus et Paulus Rome evangelizarent et fundarent Ecclesiam. Post vero horum excessum Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri et ipse que a Petro annanista erant, per Scripta nobla tradicit." « Father Tillemont and other Roman Catholic, as well as all the Protestant writers, assign a much earlier date to this Gospel. Baronius, with whom Calmet and Celliler agree, says it was written in the year 41. (See Annals, a.D. 41, paragraph 15).

Clement, and, also, that Alexander obtained the fifth

succession from Peter and Paul."

Optatus gives the same succession, except that he

places Clement before Anacletus."

Rufinus, in his preface to the Recognitions of Clement, says, that it was the common opinion that Linus, Cletus, and Clemens succeeded as Bishops of Rome while St. Peter was still alive, and adds—"Some inquire how, seeing Linus and Cletus were bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, Clement himself writing to James, could say, that the See was delivered to him by Peter; whereof this reason has been given us (mark, he does not give it as his own supposition merely, but as he had it by tradition from others)—viz., that Linus and Cletus were, indeed, Bishops of Rome before Clement, while Peter was yet living—viz., that they might take the charge of the bishopric, while he, himself, fulfilled the effice of the apostleship."

St. Epiphanius assigns the same reason for the appointment of Linus, Cletus, and Clemens as Bishops of Rome—viz., "Because the Apostles Peter and Paul did take journeys into other countries for preaching Christ, but the city of Rome could not be without a bishop.""

St. Epiphanius tells us that Peter often visited Pontus and Bithynia, and alludes, also, to St. Paul having visited

Cardinal Baronius goes still further, and asserts that it was the office of St. Peter, as an apostle, not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, and to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, but thoroughly to establish believers.

St. Chrysostom shews, that the offices of Apostle and shop are in truth inconsistent; "the Apostles being Bishop are in truth inconsistent; "the Apostles being rulers ordained by God, rulers not taking several nations and cities, but all of them in common entrusted with the whole world." Whereas, Bishops are pastors who "do sit, Whereas, Bishops are pastors who "do sit,

and are employed in one place."d

Baronius also (in p. 537) enumerates the names of a variety of Churches which claim to have been planted by Variety of Churches which chain to have been planted by St. Peter or his disciples—Mauritania, Numidia, Britain, all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, &c., &c., and in another place, A.D. xxxix, p. 272, says, "How could he who had the care, not of one city only, but of all Christendom; who was bound to provide for all, to visit all, if he could, to instruct, to admonish all—in short, to feed the whole flock entrusted to him—how could be (and espewhole flock entrusted to him—how could he (and especially in times when the Christian faith was everywhere assailed, both by Jews and Gentiles—how could he be con-fined within the limits of one city, however dignified, and not rather (as St. Luke testifies he did) go round and visit all the Churches?

What a powerful and convincing reason to satisfy any reflecting mind that St. Peter never undertook the office of Bishop of Rome—an office the duties of which he well knew were incompatible with his higher engagements as an

Apostle!*
We have other cogent reasons to give why we do not believe that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, but we pause here to ask whether any of our correspondents, or any other advocate of the Roman Catholic Church, will try to get over any of the three difficulties we have already suggested.

In the meantime, will our readers believe that in the foregoing article we have actually been dealing with what are usually considered by Roman Catholics as some of the strongest passages and arguments which the advocates of apacy have ever adduced in favour of the key-stone of their whole system—viz., the (disputed) fact that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome.

* " πεμπτην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατάγων δια-

"" πεμπτην άπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατάγων διαδοχην."—Book iv., c. 1.

** Lino successit Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, Anacleto Evaristus,
Bvaristo Alexander, Alexandro Sixtus, &c.—Lib. fil. Dupin's Ed.,
p. 31. We may here observe that the learned Jesuits Labbe and
Cossart, whose "Concilia Generalia" we have so often occasion to
quote, in vol. xvi., page 130., give a list of the Bishops of Rome, in
which Cletus and Anacletus are treated as distinct persons, one of
whom preceded Clemens, and the other-succeeded him. See Catholic
Layman, vol. ii., p. 137. Dr. Milner, also, in his End of Controversy
(letter xxviii., note), assumes Cletus and Anacletus to be distinct
persons.

persons.

y Quidam enim requirunt quo modo, cum Linus et Cletus in urbe
Roma ante Clementem hunc fuerint Episcopi, ipse Clemens, ad
Jacobum scribens, sibi dicat à Petro docendi Cathedram traditam,

Jacobum scribens, sibi dicat à Petro docendi Cathedram traditam, cujus rei hanc accepimus es-e rationem, quod Linus et Cletus fuerunt quidem antè Clementem Episcopi in urbe Roma, sed supersitie Petro; videlicet ut illi Episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero Apostolatus impleret officium."—Rufin, in Præf. ad Cleme. Recogo.

2 Πλην άλλὰ καὶ οὐτως ἡδύνατο ἔτι περίοντων τῶν ᾿Αποστόλων, φημί δε τῶν περί Πέτρον και Παῦλον, Επισκόπους άλλους καθίστασθαι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς ᾿Αποστόλους πολλάκις ἐπὶ τάς ἄλλας πατρίδας τὴν πορείαν στέλλεσθαι, διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα του Χριστοῦ μη δυνασθαι δὲ τὴν τῶν ՝ Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἀνεν Ἐπισ-

μη δυνασθαι δέ τὴν τῶν 'Ρωμαίων πόλιν ἄνευ 'Επισ-κοπου ειναι.— Epip. Hœres. 27, ut supra. - Πέτρος πολλάκις Πόντον καὶ Βιθυνὶαν ἐπεσκεψατο. - Ιδία—" Petrus vero Pontum ac Bithyniam sæpenumero pera-gravir.

gravic.

B Baron. Annales, 58. Sec 51. vol. i, p. 536.

""Αρχοντές είσιν ὑπὸ του θεοῦ χειροτονηθέντες οι Απόστολοι" ἄρχοντες ὀυκ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις διαφόρους λαμβάνοντες, άλλα παντες κοινή την δικουμέν έμπιστευθέντες." - Chryst. op. tom. 8, p. 115. Pa

1838.
4 ·· Οὶ καθήμενοι καὶ περὶ ἔνα τόπον ἡσχολημένοι."
—Id. in Eph. 4. 11, tom. 11. p. 95.

THE DOUAY BIBLE, ITS HISTORY AND AUTHORITY.

WE have already devoted several pages to the discussion of the numerous important and interesting questions con-nected with the Roman Catholic English Bible. Our chief object has been to open the eyes of our Roman Catholic readers to the remarkable fact that the present Dougy Bible differs from the original one in a multitude of places; and that, in the great majority of instances, the changes which have been made are corrections introduced from the Protestant authorised version. We propose in this article to add some further particulars relative to the history and authority of this famous Douay Bible.

It could have been no light cause that led to the translation of the Bible into English by Roman Catholics; for it is a recognised dogma of the Church of Rome that ver-nacular translations of the Bible are not necessary for the laity, and that they should not be allowed to use them without the express sanction of a bishop or priest. It is true, this fact has been often and indignantly denied by Roman Catholics; but the evidence on which it rests is too strong to be overthrown by mere assertion. It is now more than six centuries since the Council of Toulouse (A.D. 1229) made its famous 14th Canon, prohibiting the laity from possessing either the New or Old Testament; but, down to the present hour, the Vatican has never intimated its disapprobation of the sentiments expressed by that Council, or in any way declared that the Scriptures are the property of the laity as well as the clergy, and ought to be read and studied by all. It was this undisguised aversion of the ruling powers of the Church of Rome to the reading of the Scriptures that forced many writers of that communion to invent all kinds of silly and ridiculous reasons why vernacular versions should not be permitted. One of these reasons, excogitated by a learned professor at Douay, about the beginning of the 17th century, is so curious that it is worth reproducing here:—"Because," says Dr. Kellison, "Christ sanctified three tongues with says Dr. Relison, "Crists sanctified three tongues with the title of the Cross, to wit, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; therefore the Church would have God's Word not to be written commonly in any other tongue than one of those three sanctified tongues." In other words, because Pilate wrote the inscription on the Cross in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (in order that every one might read it), therefore the written Word of God ought to be limited to the same three languages (in order that the multitude may not be able to read it)! A hundred years later, Roman Catholics found it more prudent, when writing for Protestants, to adopt a different tone in reference to the circulation of the Scriptures. Dr. Milner, for example, thus writes in the year 1808 (Tour in Ireland, Letter xviii.)—"With respect year 1808 (1 our in Ireland, Letter Will.)—
to the laity, she (the Church of Rome) never interdicted
the Bible to them, as Protestants suppose; but she enjoined that those who took the mysterious Book in hand should have received such a tincture of learning as to be able to read it in one or other of the learned languages, unless their pastor judged, from their good sense and good dispositions, that they would derive no mischief from reading it in the valgar tongue. At present, however, the Catholic prelates do not think it necessary to enforce even this prelates do not think it necessary to enforce even this restriction; and, accordingly, you may find in the shops of all the principal booksellers in Ireland, Bibles in folio, in quarto, and in octavo, which are indiscriminately offered for sale with the entire approbation of those prelates."d And some years later (1825), Ipr. Doyle, in his examination before a committee of the House of Lords, stated—"That we have no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the presssion of it by the laity of our Church is "That we have no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the possession of it by the laity of our Church, is best proved by the great many editions it has gone through in Ireland, under our express sanction; and to which editions there is prefixed a rescript of Pius VI., directed to a prelate in Italy called Martini, who had translated the Bible out of the Vulgate into the Italian language. We prefix this rescript of Pius VI. to our editions in English of the Bible, in order to show that not only we, but the head of our Church is joined with us in exharting the faithful to read the word of God...So that, of all things said of us, there is not anything said of us more opposed to truth than that we are averse to the circulation of the Word of God."-Phelan's Digest of Evi-

dence, &c., 1, p. 221.

Such are the statements made by Roman Catholic divines, when speaking or writing for Protestants. But, on suitable occasions, and before fit heavers, their language is very different. Thus, the same Dr. Milner elsewhere not only admits, but justifies, the restrictions placed by his _" Substituting, Church on the reading of Scripture: __ Substituting," he says, "the dead letter of the text for the living voice of the Church, is the ready means of undermining the Catholic

Vile CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. I., p. 42. Vol. II., pp. 49, 61, 74.

Vol. IV., p. 75.

b Our materials are for the most part taken from Archdeacon Cotton's valuable work, entitled "Rhemes and Doway."

c Answer to Sulliffe, p. 157, Rhemes, 1608 (the year before the publication of the l'ouay Bible).

d As a comment on this bold statement about the abundance to

faith."—(Suppl. Mem. of Eng. Cath., p. 244.) The late Mr. Sheil re-echoed the same sentiment in a speech made at Cork, in the year 1824, in the course of which he said-"There was one point which he would concede to those whom he opposed. If it were a triumph, they might have If it were a triumph, they might have whom he opposed. If it were a triumph, they might have it. He would confess that reading the Bible was subversive of the Roman Catholic Church."—(Report of the Discussions, &c., p. 40) Nor are these antiquated notions. Cardinal Wiseman, the highest Roman Catholic functionary in this empire, has deliberately recorded his opinion on the subject in a recent pamphlet, entitled "The Catholic doctrine on the use of the Bible." He thus writes (p. 20), "If, therefore, we be asked, why we do not give the Bible indifferently to all; and the shutting up (as it is called) of God's word be disdainfully thrown in our face: we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the face; we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the taunt by denial, or by attempts to prove that our principles on this subject are not antagonistic to those of Pro-They are antagonistic: and we glory in avowing testants. it." And again (p. 26), "But though the Scriptures may be here permitted, we do not urge them on our people: we do not encourage them to read them: we do not spread them

to the utmost among them: certainly not."
Such being the established and avowed sentiments of the Church of Rome respecting the circulation of the Scriptures among the laity, it could have been, as we have said, no light motive which induced such devoted adherents as the founders of the College at Douay to undertake a trans-lation of them into English; especially at that time, when the opposition to everything having the remotest affinity the opposition to everything having the remotest annity with Protestant principles was most violent and determined. What, then, was this motive? It may be stated very briefly;—necessity. When the English Protestant versions made during the reign of Henry VIII. had, despite of all opposition, become so widely diffused among the people that all notion of suppressing the circulation of God's Word was abandoned as hopeless, the adherents of Rome had new the research as a respit has a respirate in the state of t other resource than to neutralize as much as possible its effect by vilifying the English Bible, and branding it with every opprobrious epithet they could invent. It was called "the Devil's Book," the Gospel of the Devil," "the "the Devil's Book," the Gospel of the Devil," "the Devil's Word." But they soon began to perceive that this mode of proceeding was attended with but poor success, and that the reading of the English Bible was becoming more and more general. They accordingly were compelled to change their tactics; and, as a matter of sheer necessity, they judged it advisable to set forth a rival version of their own.

Accordingly, in the year 1582, an edition of the New Testament in English was published at Rheims, whither the College of Douay (established fourteen years before) had been temporarily transferred. This version was furnished with a copious body of annotations, fiercely polemical in their tone, and assailing in the bitterest and most abusive terms the Protestant Versions. The translation was chiefly the work of Gregory Martin. The Annotations were supplied

by Cardinal Allen and Dr. Bristow.

In the Preface we are told the reasons which led to the making of the Version:—" Not upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongues, or that they ought or were ordained by God to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth and heareth them in a derstood of every one that readeth and neareth them in a known language; or that they were not often, through man's malice and infirmity, pernicious and much hurtful to many, or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical and learned languages: not from these or any such like causes do we translate the sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, into which divers things are either necessary or profitable and medicinal now, that otherwise in the peace of the Church were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable. We, therefore, having compassion to see our beloved countrymen, with extreme danger of their souls, to use only such profane translations and erroneous men's mere phantasies for the pure and blessed word of truth...have set forth the New Testament, to begin withal, trusting that it may give occasion, after diligent perusal thereof, to lay away at least such impure versions as you (benign readers) have been hitherto forced to occupy." Such were the motives which induced the divines of Douay to translate the Bible inte English. Their zeal does not appear to have found much favour with the heads of their Church, if we may judge from the fact that no less than twenty-seven years elapsed between the publication of the New Testament and the Old. The translation of the New Testament appeared, as we have said, at Rheims, in the year 1582. That of the we have said, at Rheims, in the year 1582. That of the Old was published at Douny 1609, 1610. In the Preface to the former we are told that the translation of the whole Bible was finished, but that the Old Testament could not yet be published for want of funds. It is not likely that this cause alone would have prevented the published. this cause alone would have prevented the publication for a space of nearly thirty years. It is worthy of remark that

The year before the publication of the English Authorised Ver-

d As a comment on this hold statement about the abundance of Bibles, in all sizes, to be found in the bookseller's slopes of Ireland, Dr. Cotton says, "I assert deliberately that, at that time, the only editions procurable were, one in large folio, published at about £4; one in 4to, published at £3 8s. 3d.; and the remnants of two Edinburgh editions, in five large 12mo. vols., the latter of which editions was advertised by Copne of Dublin, at the price of £1 12s. 6d., in boards; a few cepies on fine paier, hot-pressed, price in super-extra binding, £3 8s. 3d." Bibles at these prices, might, doubtless, be "indiscriminately offered" for sale, as Dr. Milner says; but we need hardly ask, How many copies would be bought?

These epithets were applied, amongst others, by Gregory Martin, - These epithers were applied, amongst others, by Gregory Martin, the translator of the Rhemish Testament, and Matthew Kellison, whose words have been quoted above. The case of Brother John, the Maye Monk, is fresh in the recollection of us all: vide Catholic Layman, April, 1852

The year before the publication of the English Authorised Ver-